

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>KRISTINA LAZORE et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiffs</b>	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>No. 1:21-cv-00239-GZS</b>
	)	
	)	
<b>JHON HARRIGAN et al. ,</b>	)	
	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants</b>	)	

**ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

*Pro se* plaintiff Kristina Lazore has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this case.<sup>1</sup> See Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (ECF No. 4) (“IFP Application”). A litigant seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* must “submit[] an affidavit that includes a statement of all” her assets and demonstrates that she is “unable to pay [the court’s] fees or give security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). Although a litigant need not prove that she is “absolutely destitute” to qualify for *in forma pauperis* status, *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948), the litigant must nevertheless provide enough information for the court to conclude that her fees should be waived, *see Young v. Frey*, Docket No. 1:20-cv-00367-NT, 2020 WL 6386389, at \*1 (D. Me. Oct. 30, 2020).

Lazore’s IFP application fails to provide sufficient information about her assets, obligations, and expenses. See IFP Application at 2. Specifically, Lazore fails to list whether she has any (i) tangible or intangible assets, (ii) regular monthly expenses, (iii) dependents, or

---

<sup>1</sup> The complaint in this case lists Lazore and an individual named Joseph Beizeo as plaintiffs but is signed only by Lazore. See Complaint (ECF No. 1) at 1, 6. Because Lazore does not purport to be a licensed attorney, she may not act on Beizeo’s behalf in this matter. See 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (“In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel . . .” (emphasis added)); *O’Diah v. Volkswagen of Amer., Inc.*, 91 F. App’x 159, 160 (1st Cir. 2004) (holding that section 1654 bars “a non-lawyer from representing anyone but” herself).

(iv) debts or other financial obligations, choosing instead to use the space on her IFP application for providing such information to reiterate her claims against the defendants. *See id.* Without this information, I cannot determine whether she qualifies to proceed *in forma pauperis* and, therefore, her IFP application is **DENIED** on the showing made. The Clerk's Office is **DIRECTED** to promptly provide Lazore with another IFP application, and Lazore is **DIRECTED**, by no later than September 24, 2021, to file an amended IFP application – fully completed with all questions answered – or pay this court's \$402 filing fee, failing which I will recommend that this case be dismissed. *See Young*, 2020 WL 6386389, at \*1 (denying an IFP application where the plaintiff failed to provide sufficient financial information but providing a deadline for the plaintiff to submit an amended application or pay the court's filing fee).

**NOTICE**

*In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), a party may serve and file an objection to this order within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof.*

*Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to review by the district court and to any further appeal of this order.*

Dated this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of September, 2021.

/s/ John H. Rich III  
John H. Rich III  
United States Magistrate Judge